



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

self; but, except on condition of ceasing to see Edith, he could not withdraw his mind from controversy; and the more he thought on the subject the more his doubts increased.

His friend Cornwall, of whom we have before spoken, and whose chambers he now shared, had been the confidant of Frank's love for Edith, and had given his full measure of sympathy to his sufferings from the obstacles which had interfered between him and his happiness. He had also been made acquainted with his religious struggles; but on this subject he was scrupulously reserved, and cautiously abstained from saying anything. At last, one day, Frank broke out—

"I wish to heaven, Cornwall, you would lay before me some of the evidence on which you believe your religion; for I long to believe something; and yet it seems to me that an infallible Church is the necessary foundation for all religion; and since it is forcing itself on my conviction that the Church has erred, I find my whole Christianity slipping from me like a dream."

"Nay," returned Cornwall, drily, "I can only repeat to you Oldham's advice—believe, and do not examine."

"What," cried Frank; "this advice from you!"

"It is the only advice for your happiness, however," replied Cornwall. "If you once examine into evidences, you will surely end in infidelity. Oldham is an old College friend of mine, and we both came to that conclusion many years ago."

"Then, good heavens!" cried Frank, "if so, why are you not a Catholic?"

"I said, Mac, that the advice was necessary for *your* happiness. I did not say it was necessary for *mine*; or, perhaps, for I shall not pretend that my creed is a happy one, there may be other things I value more. However, I believe that a certain belief is necessary for the happiness of almost all women, and of many men, among whom I have always reckoned you one. And the only method I know of maintaining such a belief, is not to pry too curiously into its foundations. 'Where ignorance is bliss, you know,'" added he, smiling.

"I can have no happiness on these terms," returned Frank, indignantly. "My happiness can never be the bliss of ignorance; it must have truth for its foundation. Yes! I agree with you," said he; "though I value happiness, there are things I value more. I value honour more; I value truth more."

"Well, Frank, my poor fellow," said Cornwall, "I pity you for what you are undergoing; I went through it myself once. I am not fond of talking of my history; but since you have forced it from me, you shall have it. It will not keep you long. You have heard a great deal of the converts that have been made to your Church, at the University to which I belong, but you do not hear anything of those who have been spoiled in the process. Grape-juice, when the fermentation is carried on a little too long, makes not good wine, but sour vinegar. The manufacturers then, I believe, throw the vinegar away, and say nothing about it. Oldham and I were of the same standing, and were great friends. We both sought for some deeper and more solid foundation for our religion than is afforded by the Anglican Church. We both came to the conclusion, that all examination into the evidences of Christianity must have unbefriended its result. But there we parted. The same medicine, you remember, which wrought a miraculous cure on Don Quixote proved nearly fatal to his unhappy squire. I had an unlucky share of mathematics in my education, which Oldham had not; and this has given me the habit of asking for evidence, and not believing without proof. I cannot mesmerize my mind into faith, as Oldham does, nor browbeat my understanding into believing. My belief must be founded on reason and argument. It would be no recommendation to me to be told, such a person is a most worthy and excellent man, but pray do not inquire into his character, for as sure as you do, you will arrive at the opinion that he is a scoundrel. So, of the two alternatives, Popery and infidelity, Oldham has chosen one, and I the other. It is ridiculous to believe, that if the evidence for the Bible fails, any evidence for an infallible Church can be found. But I am wiser than some of my friends, and keep my doubts to myself; and, perhaps, if the truth were known, Oldham and I do not much disagree; and he does not believe more than myself."

"Oh! monstrous," cried Frank; "I cannot with patience hear you impute insincerity to a man so holy as Mr. Oldham."

"Holiness in your Church," said Cornwall, "is a quality attributed to those who can master the grosser bodily appetites; but you think too little of the virtues of the mind, such as truth and charity. That I am not unjust to Mr. Oldham, only consider the principles he has avowed during his whole life. Long before he left the Church of England, he expressed his approbation of the system of 'Double Doctrine,' avowed by some of the Fathers; of their φερακισμὸς and οἰκονομία: of their rule for speaking the truth only to those who are fit recipients, but when consideration is necessary, then being false or uttering a falsehood. And he acted on his principles. You know how, for three or four years, he professed himself a member of the Church of England, when he, in reality, held the doctrines of your Church; how he justified himself or speaking, not the language which he believed to be true, but the language which a consensus of great divines had made him safe in speaking, or the language which was

necessary to his position. Now, when he professes his belief in the melting of the blood of Januarius, and in the winking picture at Rimini (things which I have heard you say your own father laughs at), what certainty have you that he is sincere? He may be only trying to 'throw himself more fully into your system,' or speaking the language which a consensus of your divines has made safe for him, or which is necessary for his position. How can you know that you are in possession of the esoteric meaning of his statements? Some time since he represented that our choice lay between Anglicanism and Romanism; that, if Rome could be resisted, it could be by no other means; and simple men who rejected, with horror, the idea of his being a Romanist in disguise, thought such passages as these decisive proof of his faithful adherence to Anglicanism; and yet, now we know that his real meaning was, that Romanism was true, and Anglicanism only the least weak of all the attempts which had been made to resist it. In like manner, when he tells us now, that our choice lies between Romanism and scepticism, that if infidelity can be resisted, it can be by no other means, how do you know but that his meaning is, that infidelity cannot be resisted at all; and that Romanism only supplies the strongest of those cordials, which weak minds find necessary to their happiness?"

By such insidious assaults as these, Frank's confidence in his former instructor was weakened; and the doubts which he had battled off before poured in a main. His religious belief had hitherto altogether rested on submission to authority, and now that his faith in that authority had been disturbed, the whole fabric tottered from its foundation. When Cornwall told him that Christianity was not founded on reason and argument—that its evidences would not bear looking into—that it was a mere development of religious sentiment, but that its facts could only be received by those who would blindly swallow whatever their instructors were pleased to teach them; Frank seemed to hear over again, in a new form, the very lessons which Oldham had taught him before. Is it any wonder that, as Frank had before *believed* without reason, so now, pushed by Oldham and pulled by Cornwall, he began to *disbelieve* without reason, and was preparing to reject Christianity, without ever once having looked into the evidences on which it rested? He seemed to himself, too, to have been admitted to a kind of freemasonry, and to have suddenly become aware of the hollowness of the professions of many of his Roman Catholic friends, whose sincerity he had never questioned before. A few even confessed their scepticism, but said, that as long as they kept their doubts to themselves, and outwardly adhered to the Church, they caused their friends no unhappiness, and their priests were satisfied with them. And now, as Frank was settling fast into unbelief, the temptation came upon him—why should he be debarred from happiness by his profession of a religion which he did not believe? Perhaps had Edith been penniless, the temptation might have been a strong one; but he shrank with loathing from the idea of appearing to barter his religion for gold. He knew, likewise, that a change in his outward profession would break his mother's heart, while Edith, herself, if she knew his real sentiments, would be rendered more unhappy by a union with him, than even if he remained a Roman Catholic. And he could not think of living in a life-long hypocrisy to her.

So his visits to Norwood became less frequent; and his spirits failed, gloom seemed settling over him, and he shrank from the subject of religion; for he could not bear to wound Edith's gentle heart by a profession of his true sentiments. And Edith marked the change, and hoped that it arose from a gradual change in his religious convictions, and her prayers for his enlightenment became daily more fervent. But all the time the cloud was settling deeper and blacker on Frank's mind.

At last he felt that the end could be no longer delayed. He wrote, in few and simple terms, that having given long and earnest thought to the subject of religion, he found it impossible to arrive at that unity of religious opinion with her, without which he could not hope to make her happy; and that, therefore, he was constrained to acquiesce in her decision that all must be at an end between them.

He had to write his letter twice, for his first copy was blotted by his tears; and then he threw himself on his bed, and writhed in agony. The blackness of darkness was upon his soul. He had been forced to abandon all those hopes of a brighter eternity, which once had afforded him glorious visions of bliss. And having lost his faith of happiness in the next world, he had now given up all his prospects of happiness in this; and his conscience seemed to tell him, that in both he had only followed the dictates of truth and honour. But he found in his heart an unutterable void.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

WAS POPE LIBERIUS A HERETIC?
TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Carlow, Jan. 2, 1854.

SIR—You have driven the infallibility of the Church to be tried and sentenced by historical facts, as you call them, and God only knows in what garb they have come to us. Are these human records infallible? Are they to be now placed above the immutable Word of God? Or are we to

arraign the Holy Scriptures before an historical tribunal? Or are we again to make Christ a criminal? And if his veracity is found wanting by the said tribunal, what is to follow? I have honestly and fairly challenged you to fight the infallibility of the Church of God with weapons from the armoury of God—the Scriptures. But facts, as you have them, you have chosen for your arms of defence; and you think I will be instantly defeated if I meet you so equipped. The facts you have put forward are two—gleaned, of course, from the written acts of the Church, from the first year of our Lord to the sixteenth century—and, if those said facts are proved no facts at all, may we then go back to Scripture. The last paragraph in your answer to my last letter, seems to be the point at issue. This position you have chosen, is dangerous—unhallowed ground; dangerous inductions you have made. It would be all very well and legitimate, no doubt, if you were treating on electricity, or dealing with some abstruse theory on geology, *a priori* then would be your proper course; by-and-bye we will be proving religion by the galvanic battery, as it is being tested by geology, but with what results is useless to enquire. Well, here we meet on your own historical domain. The first Council of Sirmium, A.D. 351, contained no heresy. Constantius banished Liberius from his popedom because he would not confirm the Milan assembly, A.D. 356, he being now nearly three years confined at Berea, the Bishop of Aquileia induced him to sign the first formulary of Sirmium, and the condemnation of Athanasius (*which was of a legal nature*) without violating the Catholic faith. He came to Rome amidst the acclamations of the Roman populace, who cried out, "One God, one fold, one head;" the Arian Pope was driven therefrom. Now, being at liberty, and in his see, he condemns the Arian heresy, writes a letter of reconciliation to Athanasius—see Theodoret. In the year 359, the Ariminum Council assembled to the number of four hundred; of those, eighty were Arians. The profession of faith that the Arians brought with them, the terms there concerning Christ, were Scriptural, though it could be construed into an Arian or a Catholic sense. The word consubstantial not being found in Scripture, the Arians artfully omitted; three hundred and twenty of the bishops rejected the formula, and anathematized Arius, his doctrines, and adherents; but Constantius ordered Valens, his faithful abettor, to direct his powers to gain the bishops, and Tauris, his wily prefect, to detain them in durance, vile at Ariminum, till they had signed the Arian formulary. Valens assured them, that he differed not with them in belief, only in the word "consubstantial," not being found in Scripture; he added, on their signing the aforesaid formulary, depended the peace and union of Christ's Church. After subscribing, they dispersed to their different sees; but finding the Arians had published a creed, in the Arian sense of the word, they immediately wrote against it, denying that they had agreed to it, or signed it; as published by Valens, &c., but thought that the divinity of Christ was fully borne out in the body of the creed, without the word consubstantial. It is not my intention to gloss over the weak actions of those bishops, for I find them *fully condemned by Pope Liberius*, and the bishops of Italy, Britain, Gaul, Dalmatia, Greece, Africa, the Islands, and nearly all the Oriental Churches. Now, here were four hundred bishops at this Council of Ariminum, *without the Pope*—a body without a head! At this time there were *upwards of two thousand bishops in the Christian Church*, scattered as they were in the above countries; deducting the Ariminum Council from the full number of bishops, leaves upwards of one thousand six hundred, with their lawful head, Pope Liberius, condemning the actions of the said Council of Ariminum (see Athanasius's letter to the Emperor Jovian). Can it be said now of the saint, with any truth, that he stood alone? I maintain there is no analogy between him and Luther; he (Luther) left the body of the Church, Athanasius stood with it. I defy any man to prove that Liberius sinned against faith; he was somewhat temporising in his actions, as seen above. The Church flourished during his pontificate, as you will find. —Fact number one disposed of.

The case of Berengarius, placed in your columns, for the last three months, as a difficulty to Roman Catholics, as regards the infallibility of their Church, surprises me very much, and the silence of "Philaethes" may seem to you a confirmation of it. I make bold to say it is no difficulty at all to "Philaethes," whoever he may be. The word "seminaliter," placed in italics, is set forward as the touchstone of infallibility. You contend that this word can mean nothing else than this—in a way that our senses can judge and perceive; but can you contend that the bishops meant nothing else? Berengarius is well known in ecclesiastical history by his falling into this pestiferous heresy, which brings his name before us now, and was (his heresy) unknown to the Christian Church up to his time? This heresiarch was of a vacillating disposition; for, when cited to appear before a council, was sure to recant, and consume his writings on the subject, showing all the dispositions of repentance. The Bishops at Rome drew up this formula (your second fact); it was put in this stringent form, that the wily man could not get out of it, and when subject to the Catholic sense, is purely orthodox. An isolated word or passage, without the aid of the context, or spirit of the treatise that it is taken from, stands very awkward in the hands of an unfriendly critic. The word

sensualiter is there set down in opposition to Berengarius's spiritual presence, not in the Caphanite* sense of the word; for we have proof positive it could not, as the good bishops then had. One of our senses hears the word, "this is my body," and we believe it sensibly [aye, burns into the very soul]. This sense hears, the word was made flesh, and we believe it true, and so of all the great dogmas of Christian belief; and I may ask by what other channel does religion come to us but by this sense of hearing? What has the feeling of touch to do with it, the sense of smell to do with it, or sight, or taste? We hear and believe—and this is said to be Protestant doctrine.—Fact number two disposed of.

I am, dear sir, yours respectfully,

A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

We ask our correspondent to consider the purpose for which we called on Roman Catholic controversialists "to deal with infallibility as a matter of fact; has the Church of Rome, in fact, been always infallible?" Putting the question thus does not imply that men can be infallible judges of the truth or falsehood of what God reveals. It does not "make Christ a criminal."

But all men do and must form some judgment, one way or the other, whether the Church of Rome be really infallible or not. And we think that every man who undertakes to support either side of the question, may fairly be required to say whether he does actually believe in the practical truth of that which he tries to support in argument. "Philalethes" brought forward the decision of Pope Nicolas II., and his 113 bishops, about Berengarius, as an infallible decision. We put it to "Philalethes" to say, "did he really believe that decision of Pope Nicolas II. and his council to be true and infallible?" and "Philalethes" has never ventured to say that he does believe it to be infallible. We call that dealing with infallibility as a question of fact; and we cannot see how it "arraigns the Holy Scriptures before an historical tribunal," or "makes Christ a criminal."

Our correspondent, however, undertakes to answer on two matters of fact; and his doing so does seem to us to prove, that he does not really feel that method of argument to be so very impious and wicked as he states it to be.

First, He enters, in a long argument, to prove that Pope Liberius did not give in to Arianism. But in that argument he never once alludes to the main document, which we produced—namely, Pope Liberius's own letter, in which he condemns Athanasius, and professes communion with the Arian bishops. We give that quotation here again:—

"I do not defend Athanasius . . . when I knew that you had justly condemned him, since it was pleasing to God, I afterwards supplied my consent to your sentence; and, in addition, I gave letters to be brought to the Emperor Constantius, by our brother Fortunatus, concerning him (Athanasius) by name—that is, concerning his condemnation. Therefore, Athanasius being removed, all your decrees concerning whom will be reverenced by me, together with the Apostolic See, I say that I have peace and unity with all of you, and with all the Eastern bishops, and through all the provinces."[†]

Our correspondent undertakes to prove that Pope Liberius did not give in to Arianism: but he does not venture to notice this letter.

To make this matter plain to him, we call his attention to the fact that the Emperor Constantius, to whom Pope Liberius wrote to say that he had condemned Athanasius, was himself an Arian, bent on establishing Arianism in the Church. Was that the man to whom a Pope should write, "That he had condemned Athanasius"? And the Eastern bishops, to whom the Pope wrote that letter, and with whom he professes to be now in *peace and unity*, were also Arians! Was this not becoming an Arian?

But to help our correspondent a little more to understand that letter of Pope Liberius, we give him here the opinion of Severinus Binus, Archbishop of Cologne, upon that letter. Our readers will remember that this Binus was the man who tried to defend the forged epistles when all others were giving them up; and they may be sure he would not give up the case about Liberius, if there was any chance of being able to deny it. And here is what he says on that letter:—

"This is that true and genuine epistle of Liberius, which, being basely and shamefully overcome by the tediousness of exile, and the fear of death (after two years of exile, and Felix being substituted for him in the pontifical see), he wrote to the Easterns, signifying that he approved the sentence given against Athanasius by their suffrages—that he admitted the Arians to his communion, and approved as Catholic the confession of faith published at Sirmium."[‡]

In that same place, Binus quotes (among other ancient testimonies) St. Jerome, speaking of the matter thus:—

"Liberius being conquered by the tediousness of exile, subscribing to HERETICAL gravity, entered Rome as a victor."[§]

Where, note, that St. Jerome says nothing of the fear of death; for which, indeed, there was no ground: it was exile that made Liberius subscribe to heresy; and, subscribing to heresy, enabled him to triumph as *Pope*, over his rival.

It was but natural that our correspondent should avoid noticing a letter which even Binus could only notice with such a confession; but our correspondent must try his hand again, if he would prove that Liberius never fell into Arianism. And we beg of our correspondent not again to overlook that letter of Pope Liberius, which tells us about it.

2nd. Our correspondent undertakes to answer for "Philalethes" (which "Philalethes" has not attempted to do for himself), about the confession which Pope Nicolas II. and the Roman Council compelled Berengarius to sign. We stated, that the Pope and Council compelled Berengarius to say—that the true body and blood of Christ was "in a sensible manner (sensualiter) handled by the hands of the priest, broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful." Our correspondent does not deny that they *said* this, and made Berengarius say it; but he asks, "Can you contend that the bishops *meant* nothing else?" Well, in our simplicity, we thought an infallible tribunal *must* mean what it *said*. Just consider the position of a Church, with an infallible tribunal, liable to say something quite different from what it *meant*! In that case, every man must judge of the truth for himself before he can venture to hear the infallible tribunal; and when he hears it, he must be prepared to say, "This infallible tribunal has *said* what was wrong; it must have *meant* something else." Surely, such a tribunal would be a snare, and not a help.

Just take this instance. The tribunal *said*, that the body of Christ is, "in a sensible manner, handled by the hands of the priest, broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful." Oh, no! says our correspondent, the tribunal *meant* to say, "that it is the sense of hearing which hears the word, 'this is my body!'" So, if you change *every other word* in the sentence, then the great word *sensualiter* may safely and properly stand in the sentence, but not otherwise. For our part, we would rather seek for the meaning of the Word of God, than have to make such wild guesses at the meaning of an infallible tribunal which cannot even say *what it means*.

Our correspondent concludes thus:—"I may ask, by what other channel does religion come to us, but by this sense of hearing? *What has the feeling of touch to do with it?*

We answer this from the Douay Bible (Luke xxiv. 39), where our Saviour said to his disciples who doubted about the truth of his resurrection, "HANDLE and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me to have."

We hold this up to our Roman Catholic readers, as a solemn warning, that they who undertake to maintain the evidence of transubstantiation, are driven to deny the proof on which our Saviour himself placed the fundamental doctrine of his religion—even his own resurrection!

POSTSCRIPT TO "PHILAETHES."

It was our correspondent "Philalethes" who first brought forward in our pages the case of Berengarius and the infallible decision of Pope Nicolas and his council. Four letters of "Philalethes," on this subject, were received and inserted by us in the past year:—1st, in January, page 9; 2nd, in July, page 81; 3rd, in September, page 104; 4th, in November, page 129. In our observations on the last two, page 105, and page 130, we called on "Philalethes," in the plainest terms, to answer this question:—"Does he think that the Pope and council were right, or does he think that they were wrong?" *He has not answered this*; and both our December and January numbers have now appeared, since we last called on him to answer, without our getting any reply to this question.

It does strike us as very strange that "Philalethes" should produce the judgment of a Pope and Council, as a decision that must be true, and yet that, when we ask him "does he really himself believe it to be true," he should not have one word to answer.

We now beg, in a friendly manner, to represent to "Philalethes" the *appearance* which his correspondence must present to ourselves and others, if he allows it to come to an end in so unsatisfactory a way.

What can we or our correspondents think but this—that while "Philalethes" was actually arguing for the infallibility of Pope and Council, he had in his own mind a secret consciousness that both Pope and Council together were fallible and wrong?

What can we think of his last letter, but that he was striving to throw dust in other people's eyes, to prevent their seeing what he himself did feel—that Pope and Council together are fallible and liable to err?

Sorry should we be to think this of any of our correspondents. We do not think it yet; we know what allowance is to be made for men; we know how far theories may impose on us, till we come to test them by facts. But we do, in a friendly and earnest manner, represent to "Philalethes," that the only way he can now free himself from this appearance of insincerity, is to come forward and state in our pages, whether he think Pope Nicolas II. and his Council were *right* or *wrong* in the confession which they compelled Berengarius to sign. Our pages are open to him still, to set himself right.

ON DEFECTS IN THE MASS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I do not know whether I should attribute to ignorance or intention the numerous errors concerning the celebration of mass which are to be found in "Talk of the Road," No. XIX., which appears in your December number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. It will be generally allowed, that among the members of the Catholic Church no doubt or hesitation is felt as to the efficacy of that holy sacrament as it is presented to their faithful view. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that those who wish to turn them from their religion use their best endeavours to inject doubts and scruples into the minds of the ignorant and unwary, as to the sublime truth contained in this capital doctrine of the Catholic faith—the real presence of Christ in the sacrament of the mass, as they see it daily administered. But, to the point. In the latter part of this "Talk of the Road" Mr. Burke ("missioner"), is represented as drawing out of his pocket a Roman Missal, at a controversial class meeting, and handing it to a certain Mickey Reilly, a "very learned man," as the story tells; but, surely, a very ignorant man, as the sequel will show, with the request that he would read out for the meeting, into English, that passage of the rubric concerning defects in the celebration of mass, which states that wax candles should be present. The words are—"Si non adiut luminaria circa." It is contained in article X. of the rubric, the title of which is, "De defectibus in ministerio ipso occurrentibus." This passage produced a great effect on Mickey, and still greater on the meeting; for we find, according to the report, that one Barney Daly stated that, often as he had heard mass in the poorhouse he could not be certain whether it was a mere wafer or the true sacrament he worshipped; nay, rather, he might be sure of the contrary; for the opinion of the meeting, and of the learned Mickey Reilly, sanctioned by the missioner, was, that if wax candles were not present, "the sacrament isn't made at all." Now, this missioner had either read the rubric, or he had not. If the latter, he was guilty of great presumption in taking the Missal out of his pocket at all. If the former, I will show that he was guilty of great dishonesty in leaving his poor hearers under a great delusion. I shall have to trouble you, sir, and your readers, to attend to a somewhat lengthy quotation from the rubric. It is, in fact, the preface at length. "Sacerdos celebratur, omnem adhibeat diligentiam, ne desit aliquid ex requisitis ad sacramentum Eucharisticum conficiendum. Potest autem defectus contingere ex parte materie consecrandae, et ex parte formae adhibenda, et ex parte ministri conficiantis. Quidquid enim horum deficit, scilicet materia debita, forma cum intentione, et ordo sacerdotalis in conficiente, non conficitur sacramentum. Et his existentibus quibuscumque aliis deficitibus, veritas adest sacramenti. Alii vero sunt defectus qui in missa celebratione occurrentes etsi veritatem sacramenti non impediunt, possunt tamen aut cum peccato aut cum scandalo contingere." Of which the following is a literal translation:—

"Let the priest about to celebrate use all diligence, that nothing be wanting of those things which are required to make the sacrament of the Eucharist. A defect can occur in respect of the matter to be consecrated, in respect of the form to be used, and in respect of the minister who performs; for, whatever of these be wanting, to wit, the proper matter, the form with intention, and priestly order in him who performs, no sacrament is made. Yet these (viz., three conditions) existing, although certain other things be wanting, the true sacrament is present. There are other defects which may occur in the celebration of mass, although they do not hinder a true sacrament; when they do happen, they must be called a sin or a scandal."

From this, then, it appears, that the conditions essential to a true sacrament are—1st. "Materia debita;" 2nd. "Forma cum intentione;" 3rd. "Ordo sacerdotalis in conficiente." In the tenth article of the rubric, there occurs the mention of a great number of defects, in the lower sense of the word, which cannot occur in the celebration, without great offence or culpable negligence on the part of the priest. Among these occur wax candles. "Si non sint luminaria circa." I have no doubt, nor can any sensible Catholic have a doubt, that tallow candles, or "dips," as they are contemptuously called, would, under the exigency of the case in question, here answer as well as wax, for the service of the mass to the faithful poor.

Having stated the case, and its refutation, without touching on other topics in No. XIX., on which much could be said,

I remain, sir, your obedient Servant,

A CATHOLIC.

We think our correspondent quite right upon the point of the candles. We think that the word "defect," is used in the rubric of the mass, for things that *do* prevent transubstantiation taking place, and *also* for things that *do not* prevent transubstantiation taking place. And this double use of the word in that rubric has led other Protestants into an error, as well as Mr. Burke, the missioner.*

We have often invited Roman Catholics to correct any erroneous statement about their religion that may appear in our pages; and we thankfully accept at their hands any such correction. We are sure that it will give confidence and satisfaction to our readers to see, that what we publish

* Sic. in MS. Query Caphanite?

† Labbe and Coss., vol. ii., p. 751. Ed. Paris, 1672. The Latin was given in our number for December, p. 142, col. 3, note.

‡ Haec est vera illa et germana epistola Liberii, quam tecido exilio mortis metu turpiter et ignominio supererat, post exactum bitemnum Exilii, Felicemque in sede pontificis subrogatum, scriptis ad orientales, significare se latam contra Athanasium sententiam suo suffragio comprobare, Arianos ad communionem admittere, editamque Sirmii professionem fidei, velut Catholicam approbare.—Given by Labbe and Cossart, in the place referred to above.

§ Liberius tecido exilio, in hereticam pravitatem subscribens, Romanus quasi vitor intravit. Same reference.

* See supra, page 6.